



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/050,515	01/18/2002	Thomas Layne Bascom	12038	7770
38598	7590	01/11/2006		
ANDREWS KURTH LLP 1350 I STREET, N.W. SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER STEVENS, ROBERT	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/050,515

Applicant(s)

BASCOM ET AL.

Examiner

Robert M. Stevens

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed 10/28/2005 to the original application no. 10/050515 filed 1/18/2002 by Bascom et al entitled "... Collecting, Storing, Managing and Providing Categorized Information Related to a Document Object".
2. The Office withdraws the previous rejections of the claims under 35 USC 103(a) in light of the amendment. However, new rejections under 35 USC 103(a) have been set forth below.
3. Claims 1-57 are pending. Claims 1, 21 and 40 are independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1, 4, 6-13, 15-20, 40, 43, 45-51 and 53-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0065671, filed Jan. 30, 2001 and claiming benefit of CIP filing date of Sep.

Art Unit: 2176

12, 2000, hereafter referred to as "Goerz") in view of Sandra E. Eddy et al. (Teach Yourself XML, IDG Books Worldwide, Inc., Foster City, CA, (c) 1999, hereafter referred to as "Eddy"). Note that the definition of "directory" has also been supplied using the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, 3rd Edition, Microsoft Press, Redmond, WA, (c) 1997, pp. 148-149 (hereafter "Microsoft Dictionary").

Regarding independent claim 1, Goerz discloses:

A method for enabling users of a network to create, store, and provide access to relationships among document objects stored on the network, the method comprising the steps of:

storing the link relationship in one or more link directories; ([0071] re: supercategories and subcategories) and
accessing one or more link relationships stored in the one or more link directories using a unique identifier for a document object, ([0007] re: no discrimination among users of prior art browsers) wherein the one or more link directories are separate from the document object. ([0071] – [0073] re: supercategories and subcategories, and further noting that it is inherent that directory has a separate existence [i.e., is stored separately] from a document object [i.e., a file], as a directory is merely "a catalog of filenames" and not the actual files. Refer to the definition of "directory" on p. 148 of the Microsoft Dictionary.)

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

allowing a user of the network to create a link relationship between a first document object and a second document object;

Eddy, though, discloses:

allowing creation of a link relationship between a first document object and a second document object; (p. 311, code listing 21-10, especially ' href="/regions/nyc.xml" ')

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would have enabled a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the allowing step comprises:
locating a first document object;
locating a second document object related to the first document object in some manner determined by the first user; and
creating a link relationship between the first document object and the second document object.

Eddy, though, discloses:

wherein the allowing step comprises:
locating a first document object; (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: the current document)
locating a second document object related to the first document object in some manner determined by the first user; (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: selection of the link [i.e., document] "nyc.xml") and
creating a link relationship between the first document object and the second document object. (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: ' href="regions/nyc.xml" ')

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would have enabled a user to use a link to choose from several locations

as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the storing step comprises:

storing a link relationship entry in a link relationship table, wherein the link relationship entry comprises fields including a first link reference to the first document object and a second link reference to the second document object;

assigning link relationship attributes to the link relationship entry;
and

setting a directional indicator for the link relationship entry.

Eddy, though, discloses:

wherein the storing step comprises:

storing a link relationship entry in a link relationship table, wherein the link relationship entry comprises fields including a first link reference to the first document object (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: the link to "nyc.xml") and a second link reference to the second document object; (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: the current document)

assigning link relationship attributes to the link relationship entry; (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: the link to "nyc.xml") and

setting a directional indicator for the link relationship entry. (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: "regions" link relationship entity of 1st line and href code assigning link references)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would have enabled a user to use a link to choose from several locations

as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent upon claim 6, the limitations of claim 6 have been previously addressed.

Goerz also discloses:

wherein the step of storing the link relationship in one or more link directories further comprises:

storing the first link reference to the first document object in a document object table; ([0041], re: indexed knowledge base 38 and supercategories)

storing the second link reference to the second document object in a document object table; ([0041], re: indexed knowledge base 38 and supercategories) and

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

assigning document object attributes to the first link reference associated with the first document object;

assigning document object attributes to the second link reference associated with the second document object.

Eddy, though, discloses:

assigning document object attributes to the first link reference associated with the first document object; (p. 311, listing 21-10 first title attribute set to "New York City")

assigning document object attributes to the second link reference associated with the second document object. (p. 311, listing 21-10 second title attribute set to "Long Island")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would have enabled a user to use a link to choose from several locations

Art Unit: 2176

as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent upon claim 7, the limitations of claim 7 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

*wherein one or more of the link relationship attributes are set; and
a directional indicator for the link relationship attribute is set by
associating one document object attribute for the first link reference with
one document object attribute for the second link reference.*

Eddy, though, discloses:

*wherein one or more of the link relationship attributes are set; (p.
311 listing 21-10, re: set of href assignment statements) and
a directional indicator for the link relationship attribute is set by
associating one document object attribute for the first link reference with
one document object attribute for the second link reference. (p. 311 listing
21-10, link direction set via href statements)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would have enabled a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent upon claim 4, the limitations of claim 4 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

further comprising displaying to a user a link reference to a document object related to a document object the user is currently accessing, wherein the link reference displayed to the user is determined by identifying those link relationships stored in the one or more link directories that include a link reference to a network address of the currently accessed document object. (Fig. 19I and [0095] discussing collaboration)

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent upon claim 9, the limitations of claim 9 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the displaying step comprises displaying more than one link reference from one or more link directories. (Fig. 19I, the display of more than one company reference)

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent upon claim 9, the limitations of claim 9 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the displaying step comprises sorting and presenting one or more link references by the one or more link directories storing the link references. (Fig. 19 E, search results numbered 1-6 are sorted alphabetically and displayed)

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent upon claim 11, the limitations of claim 11 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the displaying step comprises sorting and presenting the one or more link references by attributes of the link relationships and link references. (Fig. 19 I, companies are sorted by type)

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

Art Unit: 2176

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the method is used on one or more of: a private network, a closed network, a public network, and a private network that is connected to a public network. (Fig. 1 #10, the Internet [a public network])

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the one or more link directories may be stored on a server connected to the network by means of a secure connection. (Fig. 1 #2, and security discussions in [0037], [0013] and [0095])

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

further comprising assigning attributes to the link relationship established between the first document object and the second document object.

Eddy, though, discloses:

further comprising assigning attributes to the link relationship established between the first document object and the second document object. (p. 311 listing 21-10, second code line re: New York Regions title attribute assigned to regions extended link [i.e., link relationship])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would have enabled a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent upon claim 16, the limitations of claim 16 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

further comprising assigning attributes to a first link reference to the first document object and a second link reference to the second document object.

Eddy, though, discloses:

further comprising assigning attributes to a first link reference to the first document object and a second link reference to the second document object. (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: title=New York City, and href=/regions/li.xml)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would have enabled a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent upon claim 16, the limitations of claim 16 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the link relationship stored in the one or more link directories may be organized, sorted, searched and filtered by one or more attributes assigned to the link relationships. (Fig. 19 I, organize, sort, search and filter by company type)

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent upon claim 17, the limitations of claim 17 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the link references stored in the one or more link directories may be organized, sorted, searched and filtered by one or more attributes assigned to the link references. (Fig. 19 I, organize, sort, search and filter by company type)

Regarding claim 20, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

further comprising displaying one or more link references to document objects on the network comprises:

*selecting the displayed link references for display based on a link relationship to the currently displayed document object; and
filtering the displayed link references by attributes.*

Eddy, though, discloses:

wherein the step of providing one or more link references to document objects on the network comprises:

selecting the displayed link references for display based on a link relationship to the currently displayed document object; (p. 309 listing 21-8, link relationship set using href) and

filtering the displayed link references by attributes. (p. 309 listing 21-8, upon link traversal play sound according to the assigned attribute)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would have enabled a user to use a link to choose from several locations

as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Regarding independent claim 40, Goerz discloses:

A computer readable medium upon which is embedded instructions for carrying out a method for enabling users of a network to create, store, and provide access to relationships among document objects stored on the network, the method comprising the steps of:

*storing the link relationship in one or more link directories; ([0071] re: supercategories and subcategories) and
accessing one or more link relationships stored in the one or more link directories using a unique identifier for a document object, ([0007] re: no discrimination among users of prior art browsers) wherein the one or more link directories are separate from the document object. ([0071] – [0073] re: supercategories and subcategories, and further noting that it is inherent that directory has a separate existence [i.e., is stored separately] from a document object [i.e., a file], as a directory is merely “a catalog of filenames” and not the actual files. Refer to the definition of “directory” on p. 148 of the Microsoft Dictionary.)*

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

allowing creation of a link relationship between a first document object and a second document object;

Eddy, though, discloses:

allowing a user of the network to create a link relationship between a first document object and a second document object; (p. 311, code listing 21-10, especially ‘ href="/regions/nyc.xml" ’)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would have enabled a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Claim 43 is substantially similar to claims 4, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claims 45-51 are substantially similar to claims 6-12, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claims 53-57 are substantially similar to claims 15-19, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

6. **Claims 21-23, 26-27, 37 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0065671, filed Jan. 30, 2001 and claiming benefit of CIP filing date of Sep. 12, 2000, hereafter referred to as "Goerz") in view of Sandra E. Eddy et al. (Teach Yourself XML, IDG Books Worldwide, Inc., Foster City, CA, (c) 1999, hereafter referred to as "Eddy") and further in view of Gupta et al. (US Patent No. 6,484,156, provisionally filed Sep. 15, 1998 and issued Nov. 19, 2002, hereafter referred to as "Gupta").

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding independent claim 21, Goerz discloses:

A system for establishing and providing access to relationships between document projects stored on a network wherein the relationship between a first document object and a second document object may be created by an individual user of the network and provided to other users of the network, the system comprising:

*one or more client devices (Fig. 1 # 16A) that access document objects stored on the network (Fig. 1 # 10) ... ; and
one or more servers (Fig. 1 #2) that store ... created by the client devices (Fig. 1 # 16A) and transmit (Fig. 1 path from #10 to #16A) ... to the client devices, (Fig. 1 # 16A)*

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

*... :
...and allow creation of link relationships between document objects;
... the link relationships ... allow access to one or more stored link relationships using a unique identifier for a document object ... one or more link relationships and link references*

Eddy, though, discloses:

*... :
... and allow creation of link relationships between document objects; (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: href assignments)
... the link relationships (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: href assignments)
... allow access to one or more stored link relationships using a unique identifier for a document object ... one or more link relationships and link references (p. 311 listing 21-10, re: href assignments and creation of extended link)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz, because to do so would have enabled a user to use a link to choose from several locations

as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Additionally, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

... :
... ;
... , wherein the one or more stored link relationships are separate from the document object.

Gupta, though, discloses:

... :
... ;
... , wherein the one or more stored link relationships are separate from the document object. (Fig. 1, noting distinction between #12 web page server, #11 streaming media server and #10 annotation server, and especially in context of Fig. 12 showing separate screens for display of annotations and a linked/associated media document)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Gupta for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy, because to do so would have allowed a system user to easily access annotations corresponding to different multimedia documents as taught by Gupta in col. 2 lines 38-40. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

These references (Goerz, Eddy and Gupta) were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Regarding claim 22, which is dependent upon claim 21, the limitations of claim 21 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the one or more servers filter and sort the link relationships and link references before transmitting the link relationships and link references to the client devices. (Fig. 19E, search results numbered 1-6 are filtered/sorted alphabetically and displayed. When/where sorting - a topic in every computer science data structure class - takes place is irrelevant from a patentability standpoint.)

Regarding claim 23, which is dependent upon claim 21, the limitations of claim 21 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the client devices filter and sort the link relationships and link references after the link relationships and link references are transmitted to the client devices from the one or more servers. (Fig. 19 E, search results numbered 1-6 are sorted alphabetically and displayed. When/where sorting - a topic in every computer science data structure class - takes place is irrelevant from a patentability standpoint.)

Regarding claim 26, which is dependent upon claim 21, the limitations of claim 21 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the one or more client devices comprise:

a client tool, wherein the client tool comprises a graphic user interface display; ([0093])

a rendering tool that renders and displays document objects (Fig. 16 C), the rendering tool comprising:

*a graphic user interface display ([0100], re: screen shots); and
a document object network address ([0095], re: group
collaborations and access to Internet resources); and*

a network access tool that connects the rendering tool and the client tool to the network. ([0094], re: online activities)

Regarding claim 27, which is dependent upon claim 26, the limitations of claim 26 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the document object network address comprises a Uniform Resource Locator. ([0095], re: URL)

Regarding claim 37, which is dependent upon claim 21, the limitations of claim 21 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the network one or more of: a private network, a closed network, a public network, and a private network that is connected to a public network. (Fig. 1 #10, the Internet [a public network])

Regarding claim 39, which is dependent upon claim 21, the limitations of claim 21 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:

wherein the one or more link directories may be stored on a server connected to the network by means of a secure connection. (Fig. 1 #2, and security discussions in [0037], [0013] and [0095])

7. **Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0065671, filed Jan. 30, 2001 and claiming benefit of CIP filing date of Sep. 12, 2000, hereafter referred to as "Goerz")

Art Unit: 2176

in view of Sandra E. Eddy et al. (Teach Yourself XML, IDG Books Worldwide, Inc., Foster City, CA, (c) 1999, hereafter referred to as "Eddy") and further in view of Gupta et al. (US Patent No. 6,484,156, provisionally filed Sep. 15, 1998 and issued Nov. 19, 2002, hereafter referred to as "Gupta") and Li (US No. 6,725,227, provisionally filed Oct. 2, 1998, hereafter referred to as "Li").

Regarding claim 38, which is dependent upon claim 21, the limitations of claim 21 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the one or more link directories are accessible only by a specific individual user of a client device.

Li, though, discloses:

wherein the one or more link directories are accessible only by a specific individual user of a client device. (col. 1 lines 53-56, re: access control)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Li for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy and Gupta, because to do so would have allowed users in a business environment to control access to information by individuals, projects and departments, as taught by Li in col. 1 lines 53-56. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Art Unit: 2176

8. **Claims 2-3, 14, 41-42 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0065671, filed Jan. 30, 2001 and claiming benefit of CIP filing date of Sep. 12, 2000, hereafter referred to as "Goerz") in view of Sandra E. Eddy et al. (Teach Yourself XML, IDG Books Worldwide, Inc., Foster City, CA, (c) 1999, hereafter referred to as "Eddy") and further in view of Li (US No. 6,725,227, provisionally filed Oct. 2, 1998, hereafter referred to as "Li").

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the accessing step comprises providing access only to authorized users.

Li, though, discloses:

wherein the providing step comprises providing access only to authorized users. (col. 1 lines 53-56, re: access control)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Li for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy, because to do so would have allowed users in a business environment to control access to information by individuals, projects and departments, as taught by Li in col. 1 lines 53-56. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

further comprising authorizing users of the network to perform the allowing, storing and accessing steps.

Li, though, discloses:

further comprising authorizing users of the network to perform the allowing, storing and providing steps. (col. 1 lines 53-56, re: access control)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Li for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy, because to do so would have allowed users in a business environment to control access to information by individuals, projects and departments, as taught by Li in col. 1 lines 53-56. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the one or more link directories are accessible only by a specific individual user of a client device.

Li, though, discloses:

wherein the one or more link directories are accessible only by a specific individual user of a client device. (col. 1 lines 53-56, re: access control)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Li for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy, because to do so would have allowed users in a business environment to control access to information by individuals, projects and departments, as taught by Li in col. 1 lines 53-56. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Claim 41 is substantially similar to claim 2, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 42 is substantially similar to claim 3, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 52 is substantially similar to claim 14, and therefore likewise rejected.

9. **Claims 5 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0065671, filed Jan. 30, 2001 and claiming benefit of CIP filing date of Sep. 12, 2000, hereafter referred to as "Goerz") in view of Sandra E. Eddy et al. (Teach Yourself XML, IDG Books Worldwide, Inc., Foster City, CA, (c) 1999, hereafter referred to as "Eddy") and further in view of Chang (US Patent No. 5,694,594, filed Nov. 14, 1994 and issued Dec. 2, 1997, hereafter referred to as "Chang").

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent upon claim 4, the limitations of claim 4 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

wherein one or more of the steps of the method are accomplished by automated procedures not requiring interaction with the user.

Chang, though, discloses:

wherein one or more of the steps of the method are accomplished by automated procedures not requiring interaction with the user. (Abstract discloses the automatic generation of links)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Chang for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy, because to do so would have allowed a user to control the generation of links as taught by Chang in col. 8 lines 61-63. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Claim 44 is substantially similar to claim 5, and therefore likewise rejected.

10. **Claims 24-25 and 28-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0065671, filed Jan. 30, 2001 and claiming benefit of CIP filing date of Sep. 12, 2000, hereafter referred to as "Goerz") in view of Sandra E. Eddy et al. (Teach Yourself

Art Unit: 2176

XML, IDG Books Worldwide, Inc., Foster City, CA, (c) 1999, hereafter referred to as "Eddy") and further in view of Gupta et al. (US Patent No. 6,484,156, provisionally filed Sep. 15, 1998 and issued Nov. 19, 2002, hereafter referred to as "Gupta") and Chang (US Patent No. 5,694,594, filed Nov. 14, 1994 and issued Dec. 2, 1997, hereafter referred to as "Chang").

Regarding claim 24, which is dependent upon claim 21, the limitations of claim 21 have been previously addressed.

Georz further discloses:

wherein the one or more servers comprise:

one or more link directories that store the link relationships created on the one or more client devices; ([0071], re: supercategories and subcategories)

a server manager module that coordinates communication ([0069], re: content management tool) between the one or more link directories ([0069], re: indexed knowledge base 38, which is used in conjunction with the content management tool), a user directory ([0057], re: user account on Website), ... , and the one or more client devices (Fig. 1 # 16A) if those client devices are requesting services from the server (Fig. 1 # 2); and

a user data store that stores information regarding authorized users of the servers and link directories ([0041], re: indexed knowledge base 38 and supercategories) and

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

a database of user profile data

Chang, though, discloses:

a database of user profile data (Abstract discloses the use of a user profile)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Chang for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy and Gupta, because to do so would have allowed a user to control the generation of links as taught by Chang in col. 8 lines 61-63. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Regarding claim 25, which is dependent upon claim 24, the limitations of claim 24 have been previously addressed.

Georz further discloses:

wherein the user data store comprises:

a user directory, the user directory comprising one or more user data records containing personal identifying information and information regarding which of the one or more link directories and the one or more servers a user may be authorized to access; ([0057], especially re: user account)

a user account store, the user account store comprising one or more user account records each containing usage data for each authorized user of the servers and link directories ([0057], especially re: user account) and

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

a user profile store, the user profile store comprising one or more user profile records each containing one or more user profiles for each authorized user of the servers and link directories;

Chang, though, discloses:

a user profile store, the user profile store comprising one or more user profile records each containing one or more user profiles for each

authorized user of the servers and link directories; (Abstract discloses the use of a user profile)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Chang for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy and Gupta, because to do so would have allowed a user to control the generation of links as taught by Chang in col. 8 lines 61-63. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Regarding claim 28, which is dependent upon claim 26, the limitations of claim 26 have been previously addressed.

Georz further discloses:

wherein the one or more servers comprise:

one or more link directories that store the link relationships; ([0071], re: supercategories and subcategories)

a communications module that coordinates communication ([0069], re: content management tool) between the one or more link directories ([0069], re: indexed knowledge base 38, which is used in conjunction with the content management tool), a user directory ([0057], re: user account on Website), ... , and the one or more client devices; (Fig. 1 # 16A) and

a user data store that stores information regarding authorized users of the client tool ([0041], re: indexed knowledge base 38 and supercategories) and

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

a database of user profile data

Chang, though, discloses:

a database of user profile data (Abstract discloses the use of a user profile)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Chang for the benefit of Goerz in view of Eddy and Gupta, because to do so would have allowed a user to control the generation of links as taught by Chang in col. 8 lines 61-63. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Regarding claim 29, which is dependent upon claim 24, the limitations of claim 24 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the one or more link directories comprise:

a link relationship table comprising a plurality of link relationship entries, the link relationship entries comprising:

a first field comprising a first link reference to a first document object of the link relationship;

a second field comprising a second link reference to a second document object of the link relationship;

one or more link relationship attributes providing information that places the link relationship in a context useful to the user; and

a directional indicator that indicates whether the link relationship between the first link reference to the first document object and the second link reference to the second document object applies in either direction or in both directions.

Eddy, though, discloses:

wherein the one or more link directories comprise:

a link relationship table comprising a plurality of link relationship entries, the link relationship entries comprising (p. 311, code listing 21-10):
a first field comprising a first link reference to a first document object of the link relationship; (p. 311, code listing 21-10 re: href="/regions/nyc.xml")
a second field comprising a second link reference to a second document object of the link relationship; (p. 311, code listing 21-10 re: href="/regions/li.xml")
one or more link relationship attributes providing information that places the link relationship in a context useful to the user; (p. 311, code listing 21-10 re: title="New York City") and
a directional indicator that indicates whether the link relationship between the first link reference to the first document object and the second link reference to the second document object applies in either direction or in both directions. (p. 311, listing 21-10 uses href to indicate link direction)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz in view of Gupta and Chang, because to do so would have enabled a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Regarding claim 30, which is dependent upon claim 29, the limitations of claim 29 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the directional indicator comprises a plurality of directional indicator fields, each directional indicator field corresponding to one of the one or more link relationship attributes and indicating whether the corresponding link relationship attribute applies in one direction or in both directions between the first link reference to the first document object and the second link reference to the second document object.

Eddy, though, discloses:

wherein the directional indicator comprises a plurality of directional indicator fields, each directional indicator field corresponding to one of the one or more link relationship attributes and indicating whether the corresponding link relationship attribute applies in one direction or in both directions between the first link reference to the first document object and the second link reference to the second document object. (p. 311, listing 21-10 uses a series of href assignments to indicate link direction)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz in view of Gupta and Chang, because to do so would have enabled a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Regarding claim 31, which is dependent upon claim 29, the limitations of claim 29 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

*wherein the one or more link directories comprise:
a document object table comprising a plurality of link reference entries, the link reference entries comprising:
a network address of the document object on the network indicated by the link reference entry wherein the unique identifier for a document object is the network address of the document object; and
one or more document object attributes providing information that places the document object indicated by the link reference entry in a context that is useful to the user.*

Eddy, though, discloses:

*wherein the one or more link directories further comprise:
a document object table comprising a plurality of link reference
entries (p. 311 listing 21-10), the link reference entries comprising:
a network address of the document object on the network indicated
by the link reference entry wherein the unique identifier for a document
object is the network address of the document object; (p. 310, code near
bottom of left column ' href="http://www.eddygrp.com/bug.doc" ') and
one or more document object attributes providing information that
places the document object indicated by the link reference entry in a
context that is useful to the user. (p. 310, code near bottom of left column
' title="Bug Report 12/3/99" ')*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz in view of Gupta and Chang, because to do so would have enabled a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Regarding claim 32, which is dependent upon claim 31, the limitations of claim 31 have been previously addressed.

Goerz further discloses:
*wherein the network address comprises a Uniform Resource
Locator. ([0095], re: URL)*

Regarding claim 33, which is dependent upon claim 31, the limitations of claim 31 have been previously addressed.

However, Goerz does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the link reference entries further comprise a listing of all link relationship entries in which the network address of the document object indicated by the link reference entry is present in the first field or the second field of the link relationship entries.

Eddy, though, discloses:

wherein the link reference entries further comprise a listing of all link relationship entries in which the network address of the document object indicated by the link reference entry is present in the first field or the second field of the link relationship entries. (p. 310 second code fragment in left-most column discloses a network address [www.eddygrp.com/bug.doc] of a document object. Where the address is stored in a record or data structure is irrelevant as far as patentability is concerned.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Eddy for the benefit of Goerz in view of Gupta and Chang, because to do so would have enabled a user to use a link to choose from several locations as taught by Eddy in the first paragraph of p. 303. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the linking of network documents.

Claim 34 is substantially similar to claim 32, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 35 is substantially similar to claim 32, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 36 is substantially similar to claim 32, and therefore likewise rejected.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It is respectfully noted that the amendments have changed the scope of the claims. It is also respectfully noted that as per the Interview Summary form PTOL-413, mailed 10/14/05, no agreement was made with respect to the claims.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Non-patent Literature**US Patent Application Publications**

Mengerink et al	2002/0073174
Rubin et al	2002/0099552

US Patents

Burner et al	6,282,548
Rivette et al	6,877,137
Lenk et al	6,366,923
Cottrille et al	6,973,616
Sastry et al	6,687,877
England	6,144,991
Sidana	6,081,829
Monier	6,032,196
Jakobson	6,697,838
Kogan et al	5,809,317
Bakke et al	5,787,440
Goodman	5,999,929
van Hoff	5,822,539
Kisor	5,809,250
Gramlich	5,826,025

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The current fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Additionally, the main number for Technology Center 2100 is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert Stevens
Art Unit 2176
Date: January 7, 2006

rms

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

1/6/2006